

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

perform surgery, while not requiring such time of study from those contemplating the regular practice as a condition to their obtaining unlimited certificates, is held, in *State* v. *Gravett* (Ohio), 55 L. R. A. 791, to be void.

RIGHT OF GOVERNOR TO VETO PART OF A BILL. — Under a constitutional power to disapprove of any item or items of an appropriation bill, the executive is held, in Com. v. Barnett (Pa.), 55 L. R. A. 882, to have the right to disapprove one or more of the subdivisions of a clause making appropriations for schools, by which the amount is distributed among separate designated schools or educational interests, either as to the beneficiary, or as to the amount, and approve the residue.

With this case is a note as to the power to veto part only of a statute.

SPENDTHRIFT TRUSTS—AGREEMENT BETWEEN BENEFICIARY AND TRUSTEES. An agreement between the beneficiary of a spendthrift trust and the trustees by which he becomes entitled to a certain portion of the income absolutely, when by the terms of the instrument creating the trust the question whether any sum should be paid to the beneficiary, and, if so, what amount, and under what circumstances, was left to the discretion of the trustees, is held, in *Murphy v. Delano* (Me.), 55 L. R. A. 727, to be void, and not to bring the specified income within the reach of creditors. See *Hutchinson v. Maxwell*, 7 Va. Law Reg. 785, and note.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—REVISION OF CODE.—The power to revise, without republication, a code of civil procedure to the extent of amending over 400 sections, repealing nearly 100, adding many new ones, and changing section numbers and headings, is denied in *Lewis v. Dunne* (Cal.), 55 L. R. A. 833, where the Constitution provides that no law shall be revised or amended by reference to its title, but in such case the act revised shall be re-enacted and published at length as revised or amended.

With this case is a note reviewing the authorities on the power of the legislature to enact a code or compilation of laws or amend many or undesignated sections thereof by a single statute.

See Brown's Case, 91 Va. 768.

Banks and Banking—National Banes—Usury.—Under the provisions of sections 5197, 5198 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, usurious interest, actually paid to a national bank, cannot, in action by the bank upon the debt, be applied in satisfaction of the principal. Congress having prescribed, as the penalty for taking usurious interest that the person paying the same may receive twice the amount in an action of debt, he can resort to no other form of proceedure. The remedy is exclusive, and the State courts can neither add to the penalty nor apply any remedy other than that as prescribed. Charleston Nat. Bank v. Bradford (W.Va.), 41 S. E. 153. Citing Driesbach v. Bank, 104 U. S. 52; Stevens v. Bank, 111 U. S. 197; Bank v. Boylen, 26 W.Va. 554, 52 Am. Rep. 113.